DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 552 EA 026 130

TITLE	Re:Learning in Pennsylvania: A Resource Book.
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Dec 90
NOTE	38p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Strategies; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Communication; Program Administration; Program Development; *Program Implementation; *School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Since 1988, considerable state and school/district energies have been devoted to implementing Re:Learning in Pennsylvania. This paper describes the experiences of Cycle I project directors who implemented Re:Learning in late 1988 or early 1989. Re:Learning is a national effort to redesign the total school system, based on Theodore Sizer's (1984) nine common principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools. It reflects the belief that participants at all levels of education must be engaged in a focused and coordinated effort. Data for this paper were obtained from interviews conducted with Pennsylvania's eight Cycle I project directors. They identified the following major tasks involved with implementing Re:Learning: (1) providing leadership and a management structure; (2) building understanding, involvement, and commitment; (3) deciding on a focus and engaging in planning, development, and implementation; and (4) dealing with potential concerns and barriers. Three figures are included. The appendix contains resources provided by Cycle I schools. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 552

EA

RE:LEARNING IN PENNSYLVANIA: A RESOURCE BOOK

Developed by

The Pennsylvania Department of Education,
The Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching,
The Pennsylvania Cycle I Re:Learning Schools,

and

Research for Better Schools, Inc.

December 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EA 026 130

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education to be the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory, serving Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and the District of Columbia. As one of ten federally-supported regional educational laboratories, RBS' mission for the past 25 years has been to collaborate with state, intermediate, and local educational agencies to improve district, school, and classroom practice. RBS is a non-profit corporation, governed by a Board of Directors made up of educational and community leaders from its region.

The RBS work involved in developing this publication was funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The development of this resource book was a collaborative effort. Drs. Irvin Edgar (Director), Joseph De Angeles and James Wetzler (staff members) of the Pennsylvania Department of Education's (PDE) Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction authorized the development of the resource book and contributed background information on PDE's Re:Learning activities. PDE Re:Learning state coordinator Jean di Sabatino also contributed background information on PDE's activities and participated in the editing of the book. Dr. Susan Arisman, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching, reviewed preliminary drafts and offered editorial suggestions. Special thanks are in order to the above individuals for their support in this endeavor.

Staff from each of Pennsylvania's initial Re:Learning school districts that contributed substantially to the preparation of this resource book were:

- Ms. Susan Robb and Mr. John Ziegler, High School Teachers, Bellefonte Area School District
- Mr. Stephen Albert, Assistant High School Principal, Central Bucks School District
- Dr. John Gould, Assistant Superintendent, Eastern Lancaster County School District
- Dr. Dustin Peters, High School Principal, Elizabethtown Area School District
- Dr. Judith Witmer, Principal for Academic Improvement, Lower Dauphin School District
- Dr. Irene Bender, Superintendent, New Hope-Solebury School District
- Ms. Holly Perry, Middle-School Principal, Sub-District Six of the School District of Philadelphia: AMY-6
- Ms. Carol Blundell, Assistant Superintendent, Tyrone Area School District.

Each of the above Re:Learning project directors/coordinators participated in a three-hour interview to describe their Re:Learning experiences and provide suggestions to assist others interested in participating in Re:Learning. Their summarized experiences and suggestions constitute the content of the book. Resources they suggested as being of potential help to others in commencing Re:Learning project activities are cited in the Appendix. They are to be particularly commended for their cooperation in participating in the interview process and for their efforts in reviewing the final draft of the book. The resource book essentially is their product.

Finally, thanks are extended to Patricia Matthews of RBS for producing this report and moving it through its multiple word processing iterations, and to Linda Lange of RBS for her assistance in editing the Appendix.

Edward Patrick
Research for Better Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Resource Book Rationale	1
Description of Re:Learning	1
Overview of Re:Learning in Pennsylvania	2
Year One	2
Year Two	3
Year Three	5
MAJOR TASKS INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTING RE:LEARNING	7
Providing Leadership and a Management Structure	7
Experiences of Cycle I Schools/Districts	8
Suggestions and Resources	9
Building Understanding, Involvement and Commitment	11
Experiences of Cycle I Schools/Districts	12
Suggestions and Resources	12
Deciding on a Focus and Engaging in Planning/Development/ Implementation	16
Experiences of Cycle I Schools/Districts	17
Suggestions and Resources	18
Dealing With Potential Concerns and Barriers	20
Experiences and Suggestions of Cycle I Schools/Districts	20
APPENDIX: RESOURCES PROVIDED BY CYCLE I SCHOOLS	25

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Project Directors'/Coordinators' Statements on Leadership and Management..... 10

Figure 2: Project Directors'/Coordinators' Statements on Building Understanding, Involvement, Commitment and Communications..... 14

Figure 3: Project Directors'/Coordinators Statements on Deciding on a Focus and Engaging in Planning/Development/Implementation..... 19

INTRODUCTION

This introduction describes the rationale underlying the preparation of this resource book, presents a description of Re:Learning, and provides an overview of Pennsylvania's Re:Learning activities to date.

Resource Book Rationale

Since late 1988, considerable state and school/district energies have been devoted to implementing Re:Learning in Pennsylvania. The schools/districts that commenced Re:Learning in late 1988 or early 1989 (Cycle I sites) acquired considerable practical experience with regard to the initial study and planning phases of Re:Learning. This resource book was prepared to share the experiences and suggestions of the Cycle I Re:Learning project directors/coordinators with others, either engaged in or interested in participating in Re:Learning.

Description of Re:Learning

Re:Learning is a national effort to redesign the total school system. It is based on Theodore Sizer's (1984) nine common principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools, and reflects the belief that if schools are to achieve their primary purpose -- to help all students learn to use their minds well -- participants at all levels of education, from the state house to the school house, must be engaged in a focused and coordinated effort. The title Re:Learning represents the partnership formed in late 1987 between the Educational Commission of the States (ECS) and the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES). Their goal was to help educators rethink the purpose of education -- its pedagogies, curricula, structures and environments -- to the end of helping all students learn to use their minds well. Hence, the title captures the bottom line, "changes with regard to learning," and how learning can be facilitated or strengthened in schools.

ECS and CES are working jointly to disseminate and support this restructuring initiative. One key aspect of this joint venture has been to influence states to engage in the Re:Learning movement. ECS' role in this partnership has been to work with governors, legislators, and policy makers while CES staff work with schools. To date, six states are participating in Re:Learning: Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. The Coalition (CES) still exists as a separate independent school-university partnership, with some 50 separate secondary schools committed to implementing Sizer's principles.

There is no correct model or "canned program" to implement in Re:Learning, rather it consists of a process wherein each particpating school decides how it will go about adapting CES' nine principles to its specific context. In that regard, Re:Learning school staff work to create schools that have:

---

*Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- an intellectual focus geared toward helping students use their minds well
- simple goals wherein students master a limited number of essential skills and knowledge
- universal goals that apply to all students
- personalized teaching/learning procedures, and site-based instructional decisionmaking
- students engaged as workers learning-to-learn, while teachers play more of a coaching role
- diplomas awarded upon successful exhibitions of mastery of essential skills and knowledge
- climates or tones that reflect trust, strong expectations, fairness and mutual respect
- staff engaged in multiple roles as generalists first and specialists second
- budgets wherein per-pupil-costs are no more than ten percent above those of traditional schools.

Re:Learning has placed a number of pre-conditions on both states and schools which must be met before they can officially be recognized as Re:Learning states/schools. These pre-conditions involve a state commitment to allocate time (5 years), dollars, staff, and a leadership structure that will support the implementation of the nine common principles in at least ten schools in a given state. At the district/school level, a school's faculty must choose to participate in Re:Learning and district/school staff must commit the time, staff and resources needed to engage in extensive study, planning, development, and implementation to redesign the school based on CES' principles over a multi-year period.

Overview of Re:Learning in Pennsylvania

This overview describes Pennsylvania state and district Re:Learning activities in the first two years of the project, and the state's proposed activities for year three.

Year One

The Pennsylvania effort to investigate the merits of Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools movement began in August 1988, when a select committee participated in a nationwide meeting on Re:Learning. This planning committee included the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) Deputy Secretary/ Commissioner for Basic Education, the associate director of the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching (PAPT: an initiative of the state system of higher education), the director of the Pennsylvania Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals (PAESSP), and the PDE director of

the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction. In an effort to help Pennsylvania school district administrators and teachers learn more about CES' principles, this original planning committee convened a series of four awareness presentations by CES, ECS, and Coalition School staff beginning in October 1988, and continuing through the winter/spring of 1989. To coordinate this activity, two PDE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction staff were designated as acting state Re:Learning co-coordinators in the fall of 1988. School districts interested in exploring restructuring were invited to send study teams to the sessions to acquire information about CES/Re:Learning, and discuss issues and concerns. In the early part of 1989, PAPT invited all interested districts to apply for $3,000 grants to support their exploratory efforts during 1989. Grants were awarded to ten schools in eight districts. By mid-1989, a state Re:Learning cadre was formed and a cadre meeting was held with CES, ECS, district, and state representatives. Pennsylvania was officially designated as a Re:Learning state in July 1989 upon Governor Casey's signing of a letter of agreement with ECS/CES committing the state to participate in Re:Learning.

While the above leadership, support, and organizational activities were occurring at the state level, the eight participating districts in year one typically engaged in some or all of the following exploratory and study activities. The districts sent participants to the state-sponsored Re:Learning meetings; appointed Re:Learning coordinators/directors; formed planning, working and/or steering committees; introduced CES principles to the staff, board and community through various presentations; purchased CES-related texts and materials; conducted small and large group faculty discussions on the nine CES principles and their potential applications; engaged in self-study activities; sent staff to visit one or more CES schools; planned and implemented CES-related workshops and presentations; worked at developing board, administrative, and staff commitment; and made some preliminary decisions about the focus that Re:Learning would take in their districts, and how it would relate to their needs and goals.

Year Two

PDE's goals for the second year of the project, September 1989 through August 1990, were to provide monetary and technical support to the initial eight participating districts (designated as Cycle I sites), attract and support additional districts (designated as Cycle II sites), maintain and strengthen the project's administrative structure, and involve institutions of higher education in the project.

In September 1989, a second meeting of the cadre was held and PDE announced that, through Governor Casey's allocation of discretionary federal dollars, the eight initial Cycle I school districts that had engaged in a period of exploration of Re:Learning would receive $25,000 each from the Department of Education to support their planning efforts during the 1989-90 school year and the summer of 1990. The Cycle I districts were asked to submit letters of commitment to PDE and respond to questions about their proposed 1989-1990 planning activities. In the course of the year, PDE, with the cooperation of PAPT, conducted several support activities for the Cycle I participants. Two-day "teacher conversation" meetings were convened by PDE in February, March, and June of 1990 to facilitate discussion and sharing among representatives of the eight districts. Each meeting was organized and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

hosted by one of the participating districts. PDE and PAPT held a two-day workshop in April 1990 on "Exhibitions" and "Teacher as Generalist First and Specialist Second." Representatives of the eight districts attended.

To attract additional districts/schools to the project, PDE conducted a regional Re:Learning awareness session (November 1989) and two regional, one-day workshops on "Student-as-Worker/Teacher-as-Coach" (February and April, 1990) for newly interested (Cycle II) districts. Nine interested districts were awarded $3,000 grants by PAPT in May 1990 to support their exploratory activities through June of 1991. Five additional districts expressed interest in the project by the end of the second year, bringing the total to 14 Cycle II districts.

Several other support and/or informational activities were undertaken to promote Re:Learning and/or assist the participating districts. PDE publicized the January 1990 National Re:Learning Teleconference and assisted with arrangements to facilitate its viewing at various sites. A PDE invitational meeting with Theodore Sizer, sponsored by PAPT, was held in May 1990 at PAPT's University Center in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. A four-day information sharing and planning session for both Cycle I and Cycle II districts was conducted at PDE's annual Shippensburg Curriculum Conference in late July 1990.

At the project administration level, PDE reorganized the state Re:Learning cadre and established an advisory committee. The cadre met in April 1990 to review policy and provide guidance with respect to obtaining community and private sector support for the project. The advisory committee met in May 1990 to identify issues pertinent to facilitating districts' implementation of the restructuring initiative, and to discuss ways and means of providing support. Both advisory groups, the cadre and the advisory committee, are scheduled to meet two to three times annually. PDE also appointed a full-time Re:Learning state coordinator in July 1990 to orchestrate state activities in support of Re:Learning and maintain liaisons with CES and ECS.

Additionally, the executive director of PAPT made arrangements with staff from six colleges and universities across the state to provide support to districts engaged in Re:Learning. Part of their charge will be to acquire information about Re:Learning pertinent to the potential complementary restructuring of teacher education.

District/school activities in year two varied. Most of the Cycle I sites continued to engage in knowledge-building and team-building-type activities. They sent staff to visit established Re:Learning schools, attended state and national seminars and workshops, engaged staff in dialogues about Re:Learning, and continued to build staff involvement and commitment. They also commenced planning and development work, and experimented with implementing one or more of the nine common principles of Re:Learning. Representative examples of the planning, development and/or pilot implementation activities that occurred at one or more of the eight Cycle I sites included: the formation of interdisciplinary teaching teams and the development of cross-curricular courses of study for select groupings of students at one or more grade levels, the identification of essential skills and knowledge for given courses and grade levels, the development of

student community service and parent involvement components, the development of mini-exhibitions of mastery, experimentation with cooperative learning techniques, the development of a school-wide advisory council to address school tone or climate, the provision of common planning times for interdisciplinary teaching teams, and the block scheduling of time for pilot interdisciplinary courses. The new Cycle II schools that committed to Re:Learning in year two engaged in exploratory and study activities similar to those engaged in by the Cycle I sites in their first year of the project.

Year Three

PDE's goals for the third year of the project are to: continue to provide financial and technical support to participating districts/ schools; increase statewide interest in Re:Learning; increase the involvement of higher education in the project, particularly with regard to pre-service teacher preparation for Re:Learning; expand efforts to obtain private sector involvement and funding; begin to integrate Re:Learning's activities with those of other bureaus in the department; and increase awareness of the initiative among state legislators. The 1990-91 state Re:Learning plan outlines a wide range of proposed activities to address the above goals. Of particular note is the fact that PDE plans to provide the following levels of funding support to Re:Learning districts in 1990-91: $14,000 to each of the 8 Cycle I sites, $7,000 to each of 14 Cycle II sites, and $3,000 to 1 to 3 districts to engage in exploratory activities. Pennsylvania also plans to phase out its designation of districts as Cycle I or Cycle II. Instead, Pennsylvania plans to refer to districts as being engaged in one of the three phases of the incremental implementation of Re:Learning: (I.) study (exploration), (II.) development or (III.) practice.

MAJOR TASKS INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTING RE:LEARNING

Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) and Educational Commission of the States (ECS) staff suggest that schools/districts, in preparing to make a commitment to Re:Learning, need to engage in a study period to: (1) acquire information about Re:Learning, (2) develop understanding and commitment, and (3) develop a plan. On committing to Re:Learning, schools/districts need to: (1) build a shared vision of education around the nine CES principles, (2) organize resources to support student learning, (3) create new working relationships, (4) develop a culture of school staff as learners, (5) coordinate all activities, and (6) treat all involved with dignity and respect. The above suggestions are outlined in two handbooks prepared by CES and ECS to assist both states and schools/districts with the implementation of Re:Learning: Re:Learning Handbook Part I, Overview (July 1989) and Re:Learning Handbook Part II, Getting Started (July 1989). Implicit in CES/ECS' suggestions are a number of major activities, many of which are related to managing a process of school change.

To help schools/districts manage the changes required by Re:Learning, CES developed the 1990 TREK READER and a companion booklet: The Trek: A Year Long Course of Study, An Action Framework for School Change. CES uses the above resources to structure the five-day TREK workshop experience it conducts periodically for teams of school/district staff. The workshop provides these teams with the leadership, content and change process skills required to "make Re:Learning happen back home." Schools/districts interested in particpating in Re:Learning are well advised to review the CES/ECS Handbooks (Parts I and II) and send staff to participate in a TREK workshop, to establish the foundation and support network necessary to affect change.

It has been CES' experience that schools/districts take multiple paths in their journey toward becoming a Coalition school. They all, however, confront the change process and can be viewed as facing a common set of tasks. Based on the interviews conducted with Pennsylvania's eight Cycle I project director/coordinators, about their exploratory and planning year experiences, it was concluded that their activities and advice to others could be subsumed under four major task areas: providing leadership and management; building understanding, involvement, and commitment; deciding on a project focus and engaging in planning/development/implementation; and dealing with potential concerns and barriers. This resource booklet provides a context, summarizes the schools'/districts' experiences, and presents experience-based suggestions for each of these task areas. Resources that may be of assistance to others embarking on or engaged in Re:Learning are also provided for the first three task areas.

Providing Leadership and a Management Structure

All significant educational change requires strong leadership and a management structure. This assertion is particularly true of Re:Learning due to its open-ended nature, the number of "second order" changes (Cuban, 1988) it potentially involves, and the concomitant uncertainties associated with defining "it" at a particular school/district site. That is, there is

no one model of Re:Learning; each school must operationally define the nine CES principles to suit its particular situation. Additionally, leadership must be both top-down and bottom-up, if the entire school community is to buy into Re:Learning.

The complex context of Re:Learning gives rise to a number of questions: Who is to take the lead initially? What committees should be formed? Who needs to be represented? What role should the principal play? What role does the central office need to play? Should committee members be selected or appointed? How and when should a teacher coordinator be selected? What goals or milestones need to be set? Who will make the decisions? How and to what extent should power be shared? What level of leadership or management structure is needed? and What leadership training will be provided? Potential answers to the above questions can be found in the experiences and suggestions of the Cycle I sites.

Experiences of Cycle I Schools/Districts

Re:Learning was initiated at each of the eight Cycle I sites by someone out of the administrative or central office ranks. Typically, a few teachers, and in some cases a board member(s) and/or parent, were invited to accompany the school/district administrator(s) on their initial trips to various presentations to acquire information about Re:Learning. On confirming an interest in Re:Learning, districts typically created both a district-level steering committee and/or a building-level committee. Attempts were usually made to insure that all role groups with vested interests were represented. The schools/districts then embarked on a more intensive study of Re:Learning and subsequently engaged in planning to implement the nine principles.

The leadership and management activities engaged in at the eight sites, however, varied with regard to:

- the extent to which board members and parents were involved up-front (active on initial committees versus participation not solicited)
- the manner in which committees were formed (in some cases teachers were appointed; in others, volunteers were recruited; and at some sites, both approaches were used)
- the extent to which central office staff fostered a climate of bottom-up involvement and empowered teachers to make decisions involving Re:Learning (true bottom-up climate versus central office retention of control)
- the timing (year one or year two) and manner (recruited, appointed and/or elected) in which a teacher coordinator was chosen, and the power (somewhat symbolic versus actual) vested in the teacher coordinator position

---

*Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 341-344.

- the level of involvement of the building principal (uninvolved, directly involved, or only superficially involved) -- and in those cases where principals were directly involved, whether they played a more traditional directive role or whether they were "one member" of the Re:Learning team or committee

- the extent to which annual goals and milestone activities were established by the Re:Learning committee (specified goals and milestone activities established versus "the activities kind of evolved")

- the leadership training and team building activities to which Re:Learning committee members were exposed (some sites had staff engage in team building activities and/or sent staff to a TREK; others did not).

Suggestions and Resources

The Cycle I Re:Learning project directors/coordinators offered a number of suggestions or recommendations to others regarding project leadership and management. In a few cases the suggestions addressed activities that some of them "wished, in retrospect, that they had done." They generally recommended that leadership staff at new Re:Learning sites:

- involve school board and parent representatives in the district's initial information seeking activities

- form district steering and building committees that include representatives of all key groups

- both seek out teacher leaders/risk takers and ask for volunteers to serve on the committees

- send a core group of Re:Learning advocates to participate in a TREK to establish a trained leadership group for Re:Learning

- establish the position of a teacher coordinator and fill it through a democratic process

- involve the principal as "a member" of the building Re:Learning committee

- delegate real power to the building committee and encourage its use

- provide strong central office support to nurture bottom-up participation in the change process

- develop annual goals and specify milestone activities to guide committee actions

- attend carefully to record keeping (minutes of meetings, budgetary matters, staff hours expended on the project, etc.).

They also offered a number of comments related to the general leadership skills, integrity and persistence needed to effect change.

The recommendations listed above appear somewhat prosaic. However, when they are stated in the project directors'/coordinators' own words they take on more life or urgency (see Figure 1).

Figure 1

Project Directors'/Coordinators' Statements on Leadership and Management

- "Recruit a core group of interested staff who can become spokespersons for the project. Try to include teachers, administrators, board members and parents in this initial core group. Let any and all interested staff participate as opposed to hand-picking people. However, try to insure that you end up with capable people in key posts."

- "You need to develop a leadership group and insure that they are trained at a TREK. This core staff needs to have a vision and commitment. It's also a good idea to form various subcommittees as major goals and tasks become defined; the teacher coordinator can't do everything and work needs to be delegated to other staff/sub-committees. Finally, someone needs to keep very careful track of absolutely everything: dollars spent, staff hours, documentation -- you need to lay out a documentation plan."

- "Turn the project totally over to the teachers (i.e., the building Re:Learning committee) including control over how the project dollars are spent. This will give the project a lot of credibility. It may take longer, but it will foster staff trust and ownership in the long run. Having a strong "bottom-up" component is essential."

- "Set some milestones and meet four to six times a year to assess and publicize progress. You need to establish credibility that the Re:Learning committee is a viable committee that meets at scheduled times, and has goals and a time commitment."

- "Answer all staff questions candidly. If you don't know how something will play itself out, say so."

- "Assess the political climate of the district. A reasonable level of stability and trust in the working relationships among the teachers, central office and the board is required before attempting a major effort like Re:Learning. Is the timing right? Are your secondary staff willing to work together? Your credibility has to be manifested day in and day out; you need to be true to CES' principles. You must let staff make reasonable decisions and mistakes. That bottom-up piece or climate is essential. The process is not about putting something into place, rather it is about removing barriers to teachers' involvement...i.e., helping teachers to understand that it is their school and facilitating their exercise of power."

- "Provide staff with an understanding of the change process right from the start. Make staff aware of the steps people go through in a change process. Do not react personally to staff resistance. Do not push people too fast. Assure staff that some elements of chaos/confusion, resistance, enthusiasm, and even backtracking and changes in direction are all part of the change process."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 1 (Cont'd)

- "Be clear about why the project is important. Be very knowledgeable about it. It needs to be both top-down and bottom-up; mutual adaptation is involved. It needs to be shaped by staff and framed by them as well. The teachers must figure out that it's the school structure that's standing in their way, and want to change it. Go at a slow and steady pace; don't be frenetic. Don't let go of the project, even if it looks like it's dying on the vine. Ride out any dissension; think positive and believe in the project. The leader must believe in and stand for the project, and be able to explain why it is important to staff. Let nothing become a crisis."

- "The district must commit enough time and dollars to foster staff involvement. This district commitment tells staff that the project is important."

Some of the above suggestions are process-oriented or hortative and do not involve a written resource per se. However, references to several leadership and management-related resources are presented in the Appendix (e.g., a committee structure and goals; a mission statement; sample meeting agendas; a planning grant, budget, and schedule; Re:Learning position descriptions).

Building Understanding, Involvement and Commitment

Effecting educational change is a challenge, because most people tend to resist change. It is threatening, often involves more work or new work, and typically is associated with a fair amount of uncertainty. This is particularly true of Re:Learning due to the broad scope of its goals and the fact that there is no model; rather, there are nine principles which are open to multiple interpretation and which school staff need to operationally define. The uncertainties associated with Re:Learning, therefore, are even greater than those associated with other more structured, delimited and defined educational innovations. More structured and delimited innovations, however, often aspire to more limited outcomes (e.g., a change in or improvements to a district's reading program). Re:Learning's ultimate appeal lies in the promise of its outcomes and the challenges that it poses to traditional educational structures.

To achieve Re:Learning's ends requires that a school systematically undertake efforts to build understanding, involvement and commitment among its staff, the board, administrators and the community. This requirement gives rise to questions such as: What are the best ways to build understanding? Should participation be voluntary or mandatory? How can staff involvement and commitment be broadened? Should a staff vote be taken to determine a school's participation in Re:Learning, and if so, when? How and when should the board (and parents) be involved? The encompassing scope of Re:Learning's goals, and the uncertainties facing a school/district with regard to how to attain them, also dictate that significant attention be devoted to developing and maintaining effective communications with all vested interest groups to avoid misunderstanding, diffuse potentially volatile issues, and keep all informed. Again, the experiences and suggestions of the Cycle I sites offer some guidance regarding the above questions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Experiences of Cycle I Schools/Districts

The Cycle I sites engaged in a combination of activities to build understanding, involvement and commitment. Initially, they sent a core group of volunteers to participate in presentations on Re:Learning. Subsequent activities, initiated by the core leadership group and/or the Re:Learning committee at one or more of the sites involved: conducting large and small group informational presentations on Re:Learning for school staff, disseminating CES-related books and articles; conducting large and small group discussions of Re:Learning focused on its potential application; soliciting teachers to commit to Re:Learning and participate on the building and/or district Re:Learning committee(s); sending staff to conferences, workshops, a TREK and/or to visit other CES schools; bringing in staff from ECS/CES and/or other CES sites to make presentations or conduct workshops; offering an inservice-for-credit workshop on Re:Learning; making presentations to the board and/or parent groups on Re:Learning; networking with other Pennsylvania Re:Learning sites; encouraging teachers to experiment with one or more of the CES principles; keeping all vested interest groups informed of the Re:Learning committee's activities; and engaging staff in building a vision of Re:Learning by assessing "where their school is now" versus "where they want it to be" regarding CES' principles.

The eight Cycle I sites' efforts to build understanding, involvement and commitment varied primarily in the timing, number, and source of the informational, workshop/inservice, and/or school visitation activities. They also varied in the extent to which efforts were made to involve board members and parents in Re:Learning. Additional variations included: the degree of visibility of central office and board support for the project; the nature and extent of the building principal's participation; the amount of time that was allocated to Re:Learning activities; the number of school staff that had the opportunity to visit CES schools and/or attend off-school-site conferences, workshops and presentations; the degree to which the Re:Learning committee was allowed/encouraged to "call its own shots" by the central office; and whether, at the end of the exploratory period, a total faculty vote was taken on whether to continue with Re:Learning, or the building Re:Learning committee came to consensus to continue.

Suggestions and Resources

There was general consensus among the Cycle I project directors/coordinators as to the types of activities that were most effective in building understanding, involvement and commitment. They recommended that leadership staff at new Re:Learning sites would be advised to:

- start by conducting overview presentations for the entire faculty
- conduct a series of follow-up smaller group staff dialogues on Re:Learning, preferably at free luncheon meetings, and engage the faculty in responding to specific focused questions about the school's current status and the implications of Re:Learning
- involve as many staff as possible in off-site conferences, workshops and CES school visits

- invite and accept all volunteers on the Re:Learning committee
- maintain an open invitation to all staff to join or sit in on committee activities
- bring in teachers (and students) from other CES schools, in addition to ECS/CES staff, to describe their Re:Learning experiences
- offer teachers incentives (inservice credit) to become involved
- use a personalized approach to broaden staff involvement (i.e., each committee member "adopts a teacher" and attempts to use his/her personal influence to persuade this uninvolved faculty member to participate in Re:Learning), and add "new participants" to the Re:Learning committee, thus building the committee's membership incrementally
- delegate real power to the Re:Learning committee
- seek out parent and board involvement early on, involve representatives of these two groups in awareness activities and visits to other schools
- conduct regular briefings by involved teaching staff for school faculty, parents and board members
- provide appropriate Re:Learning workshop/training experiences for staff (e.g., cooperative learning, student-as-worker) and encourage them to try out the new practices.

A recurring theme embedded in each of the project directors/coordinators comments on building understanding, involvement and commitment was the importance and need for good communications with all interest groups. They stressed the importance of:

- having constant positive contacts with the board, parent groups and the community
- designating one person to coordinate the flow of information and communication
- establishing Re:Learning bulletin boards and a regular project newsletter for teachers and/or parents
- sharing/posting the minutes of committee meetings
- having the superintendent clear proposed public communications with school staff to avoid surprises
- providing time for teachers from different departments and grade levels to communicate with each other about Re:Learning
- finding a way for staff who have visited other CES sites to debrief and share their findings with the school staff

- providing a way for teachers experimenting with aspects of Re:Learning to share their ideas/experiences with others (e.g., idea newsletter).

Similar to the preceding section, the project directors'/coordinators' recommendations take on more life or urgency when they are presented in their own words (see Figure 2).

Figure 2

Project Directors'/Coordinators' Statements on Building Understanding, Involvement, Commitment and Communications

- "Communicate initially with both large and small groups of staff about the project and its purpose. Distribute written briefs on the project and ask for volunteers. Get a dialogue going among staff about the project. This will help to develop a sense of community. However, be aware of the fact that you won't catch everybody."

- "It must initially be a volunteer-based initiative. You can have required workshops and meetings, but eventually staff involvement must be based on their own choice. However, also exercise good political sense by involving significant others who need to be involved or whose blessing is needed."

- "Get a small cadre of interested teachers committed to the project and let them do the proselytizing. Ask them each to recruit another person. Add staff to the team after they have participated in a Re:Learning event (e.g., visited a CES school, attended a Harrisburg workshop). Keep gradually expanding the group over time through this process of personal, one-on-one recruitment. Be sensitive to and capitalize on circles of friendships and communication. Let the core team make the operational project decisions. Stay out of an administrative top-down role."

- "Find a way to have as many of your school staff as possible visit/see CES schools, staff and kids in person (or on tape). It is a very powerful experience. The CES students have an assurance/aplomb that's gripping. Also, let as many of your staff as possible attend various Re:Learning conferences/workshops. We came up with a creative way to permit six or seven of our staff to leave the building for a day to attend Re:Learning events and visit CES sites. We divided our grade 6 to 8 students alphabetically and formed vertically graded groups of students (grades 6-8). We designed lessons for a day that any student could do -- on generic, but relevant topics/skills. The staff who remained on site for the day, each taught one lesson and repeated it five times. Overall in our exploratory year we had three "generic days" and were able to send our staff to Central Park East. We also did this in the late fall of 1989 when we sent several staff to CES' fall Forum in Rhode Island."

- "Involve the central office staff and the board in various visits to other sites and in the workshops offered by the state. Involved board members can keep the rest of the board informed. Deal with board members individually as well as collectively."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 2 (Cont'd.)

- "Consider offering an inservice-for-credit course on Re:Learning to involve more staff and engage them in structured discussions of Re:Learning. Our teachers developed an inservice-for-credit course which eventually led to the active involvement of 15 more people, about a quarter of our school staff."

- "Use a variety of approaches to inform staff of Re:Learning. We placed multiple copies of CES' Horace newsletter, and Sizer's and Wiggins' texts in both of our high schools. We also distributed various other articles to all staff along with the minutes of our committee meetings."

- "Ensure that your staff have access to CES literature and articles. Set aside school time for discussion, reaction, and response (faculty meetings, etc.). Do not talk to or at staff, rather, engage them in responding, and solicit their opinions."

- "Consider using your inservice days to promote Re:Learning. We conducted inservice-day reading/discussion sessions on Sizer's work. We bought one book for every three or four teachers and gave them several months to read it. Then, we had guided small group discussions on the book's contents, summarized the groups' reactions and shared the summaries with all staff. We also distributed a ten page summary of the book. Following this we conducted the "ideal/reality" exercise in small groups and merged the results. We also asked our teachers to do the exercise with students."

- "Invite your staff to luncheon information-discussion sessions and feed them. This really works. It attracts people, sets a warm tone, and starts a real dialogue among staff. Hold faculty lunches or have small-group lunches in different teachers' rooms, and ask people to volunteer to participate in the project."

- "Be proactive in reaching out to the community. We held a community forum which was very well received. Our teachers did key parts of the preparation and presentations to explain Re:Learning and how it would help our students."

- "Recognize that people need sound reasons for changing. Be careful about not pushing the project down people's throats. People need time to interact with the project's concepts."

- "Constantly invite people to become a part of Re:Learning. Teachers are reluctant to volunteer. You need to proactively seek out people over and over."

- "Recognize that three general problem areas will continually need to be attended to during the course of the project: communication issues, lack of time, and reluctance of staff to change, in part, due to a lack of trust and personal concerns."

- "Focus on communications. Establish a common bulletin board for the project. Post events, activities and information/articles. Communicate with all staff frequently both in person and in writing. Keep records/notes of meetings, conferences, agendas, visits etc., in notebook form and make copies readily available to all staff (copies in faculty room, library and/or to department heads). Be attentive to and listen to staff. Communication has to flow, and one person should coordinate the flow of communication."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 2 (Cont'd.)

- "Consider developing a separate newsletter at the onset to keep all school/district staff informed and/or feature the project in the school newsletter."

- "Consider getting sample reactions to written communications before you release them to the staff or community. This will help you avoid some controversies and misunderstandings."

There was no consensus on the need for a school staff to vote to continue with Re:Learning. Two of the eight sites, did conduct successfully a faculty vote. At the remaining sites, the committee members agreed to continue with the project. The project directors/coordinators reported that both approaches seemed to work. However, if a vote is planned, they indicated that it should only occur after an extended period of study that involves the entire faculty.

The Appendix references a variety of resources related to building understanding, involvement, commitment, and effective communications (e.g., summaries of Re:Learning readings, sample minutes of meetings, samples of the dialogue questions posed to school staff and summaries of their responses, an inservice for credit course outline, sample communications to parents and community members, and sample school/district Re:Learning newsletters).

Deciding on a Focus and Engaging in Planning/ Development/Implementation

The CES booklet, The TREK: A Year Long Course of Study -- An Action Framework for School Change (1990), suggests that a TREK-trained RE:Learning school leadership team (committee) can serve as a tool to lead the school's staff through a three-phase change process that involves repeated cycles of: (1) diagnosing, (2) visioning, and (3) planning/acting/reflecting. It notes that five interdependent facets need to be examined in order to move forward with Re:Learning: (1) the nine common principles, (2) the school's educational goals (formal and informal), (3) the school's structure (budget, curriculum, schedule, assessment processes, policies, etc.), (4) the daily experiences that make up the day-to-day lives of students, teachers and administrators, and (5) the school's culture (the collective beliefs, attitudes, values and habits that make the school what it is). Examples of school staff activities related to the three-phase change process are provided. Essential to the success of the above action framework are a number of group leadership and group process skills, skills that are required to enable a group of school staff to work together closely as a team toward the common end of managing educational change. The week-long TREK workshop is designed to model these change process strategies and team-building/management skills for participating school staff, so that they, in turn, can model and apply them with their own colleagues back home.

The task of deciding on a focus and subsequently engaging in development/implementation activities gives rise to a number of questions: Who needs to decide? How should decisions be made? What strategies or

processes are available to diagnose the current status of a school? What questions need to be considered? Who should be involved? How should needs or weaknesses be treated? How do you come to consensus on a vision? How should development/implementation proceed; via developing a school-within-a-school, one grade level at a time, on a pilot project basis, or by starting implementation building wide?

Experiences of Cycle I Schools/Districts

To determine a focus, most of the Cycle I sites engaged in a variation of the "ideal versus reality" exercise (a variation of a needs assessment process wherein one asks "what is" versus "what should be" regarding a given school factor...e.g., student attendance, parent involvement, students' capabilities upon graduating). Several of the sites started at the whole school level and asked staff to respond to the questions: What is working well? What is not working well? and What do we need to change? These sites then had staff review the nine CES principles to determine the implications each principle had for the school's goals, structure, and culture. Staff were asked to: read and discuss the nine principles, state them in their own words, indicate what the school was doing now that reflected the principles, determine what they and the school might do to incorporate or support them, and indicate priorities for action. Most of the above activities were conducted by having staff work in small groups. The data reported-back by the groups was then aggregated and shared with the entire staff. Additional self-assessment activities engaged in at several of the sites included student shadowing studies, questionnaires to staff about the implications of various aspects of Re:Learning, and/or input from students about "real versus ideal" learning and school situations.

The Re:Learning committees at the Cycle I sites evaluated the self-assessment information obtained through the activities cited above and determined priorities for further action through a process of group consensus. Typically, sub-committees were formed to draft proposals for specific actions (e.g., developing a student advisory system or a ninth-grade, core teaching team), and the completed proposals were submitted to the central office and/or the board for input and approval. In a few instances working meetings were held with the board to assist in determining the school's/district's initial focus.

The committees at most of the sites were influenced by and/or responded to pragmatic factors. For example, at some sites the decisions as to where to start were influenced by: an existing problem that "just needed to be addressed," the presence of a group of advocates at a particular grade level who were willing to work as a team, and/or the willingness of several teachers at various grade levels to experiment with interdisciplinary team teaching. The committees at most sites also tried to tie Re:Learning to ongoing district initiatives (e.g., cooperative learning, thinking skills), and a few formed ad hoc committees to deal with "spin-off needs" identified in the course of the self-assessment. Additionally, a lot of informal in-class experimentation by interested teachers occurred at most of the sites, particularly with respect to the principles of "personalization" and "student-as-worker/teacher-as-coach."

At the point in time at which the interviews, on which this resource booklet is based, were conducted, most of the Cycle I sites had plans to focus on a number of CES principles (see Re:Learning in Pennsylvania: A Status Report, October 1990). All sites bought into the principle of "student-as-worker/teacher-as-coach" and were in various stages of planning to act on the principle of "personalization" by forming core-subject teaching teams, modifying schedules and assigning a subset of students to the core teaching team at a given grade level or levels. Several sites had also developed proposals for interdisciplinary or cross-curricular courses to be taught by two or more teachers. Activities were also underway in at least half of the sites to develop essential questions for specific courses, in order to respond to the principle of "simple goals" (i.e., "less-is-more"). Efforts were also underway at several sites to make a community service component available to students. Overall, the Cycle I sites opted to initiate Re:Learning implementation activities on a incremental pilot basis, either by forming core teams at one grade level at a time, and/or by experimenting with interdisciplinary courses across various subject areas at one or more grade levels. Two approaches to implementation that were generally rejected by the sites were forming a school-within-a-school, and initiating implementation building-wide.

The Cycle I sites' efforts at deciding on a focus (and engaging in planning/development/implementation) varied with regard to the extent to which the entire school faculty was involved in deciding on a focus (i.e., self-assessment activities). At most sites the entire faculty was involved. In contrast, at a few sites the Re:Learning committee members decided on a focus with little faculty input or involvement. The sites also varied in whether they tied the initial Re:Learning efforts to a visible school problem or whether they proceeded on multiple fronts. Additionally they varied in the time taken to begin development/implementation, the focus chosen (grade level based core teaching teams and/or pilot interdisciplinary courses/project), the number of interdisciplinary courses proposed (one or several), and the number of CES principles addressed.

Suggestions and Resources

The primary suggestions offered to others by the majority of the Cycle I project directors/coordinators with regard to deciding on a focus and engaging in planning/development/implementation were to:

- let the Re:Learning committee make the major decisions either by a process of group consensus or a vote
- involve as many faculty as possible in the CES prescribed self-assessment activities (i.e., ideal versus reality exercise and shadowing studies), and solicit student input as well
- form sub-committees to study select topics (e.g., "personalization" and "student-as-worker") and prepare proposals for implementation
- solicit proposals for cross-curricular courses from interested groups of staff

- encourage and support staff experimentation with CES' principles
- insure that the Re:Learning committee works closely with the administration and the board on proposal development
- share Re:Learning proposals with the faculty for reaction and input
- provide staff with the requisite training needed to plan and develop Re:Learning (i.e., workshops on "student-as-worker/teacher-as-coach," "student exhibitions," developing "essential questions," etc.)
- proceed toward the goal of an "essential school" via working one grade level at a time and/or developing model interdisciplinary courses for staff to emulate
- try to tie some of the initial proposals and implementation efforts to a commonly perceived need so that the majority of the staff can see some immediate, relevant activities or results.

Once again, the project directors'/coordinators' recommendations are more persuasive and compelling when stated in their own words (see Figure 3).

Figure 3

Project Directors'/Coordinators Statements on Deciding on a Focus and Engaging in Planning/Development/Implementation

- "Avoid, as a project leader, starting with a fixed, pre-identified set of problems and solutions. It's best to start with a set of focused questions (e.g, What's going well in the school and classes? What's going less well? What do we want or need to change? What do we need to do to get there?) and solicit faculty input."
- "Involve your faculty, early on, in the identification of specific school-related issues or concerns. The staff needs to recognize there's a specific need to do something about an issue. Then, examine the Re:Learning principles and see if they can help with the problem. Go slowly. You need to find people who are interested and committed."
- "In the course of the exploratory year, conduct the 'ideal versus reality' exercise with school staff and also have volunteer staff conduct shadowing studies of students. Report back the findings to the core group. Consider involving students in the 'ideal versus reality' exercise."
- "Avoid identifying 'ideal versus reality' discrepancies as 'problems' in your initial staff discussions of the nine principles. Labeling discrepancies as problems can have a negative connotation, be threatening to faculty, and result in defensive staff behaviors. It's best if they are identified as 'concerns.' You first need to draw out staff concerns and then develop strategies to deal with them."
- "Identify a school need early on in the self-assessment process (e.g., 'ideal versus reality' assessment), and focus on a CES principle or principles that might apply to the need. This will help staff see the relevance of the project, and provide an immediate, real focus."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 3 (Cont'd.)

- "If a major need or concern surfaces, consider capitalizing on it. For example, at our site, we identified a major concern related to the apparent inability of our seventh grade students to work and learn independently via traditional classroom instruction. Having adopted an initial focus, we included all of our seventh grade teachers in our invitation to all Re:Learning workshops. We also conducted a workshop on nurturing students for our staff during the summer of our exploratory year. Our seventh grade teachers met after this workshop to discuss and begin planning how they could change how they work with students."

A number of resources related to deciding on a focus and engaging in planning/development/implementation are cited in the Appendix (e.g., sample ideal versus reality exercises, shadowing study information, grade level core team proposals, a school advisory proposal, sample essential questions, and interdisciplinary/cross-curricula proposals).

Dealing With Potential Concerns and Barriers

The charge of leading and managing a major educational reform initiative like Re:Learning in a school/district is formidable. Certain aspects of reform are also predictable -- namely, that one is guaranteed to encounter some major issues, concerns, and barriers among various vested interest groups or participants. Some of the concerns or barriers are somewhat generic (e.g., peoples' general resistance to change due to personal concerns) and others are more project specific. The purpose of this section is to share with others the concerns and barriers that were encountered by the Cycle I project directors/coordinators in the first year or two of their activities in Re:Learning, and their suggestions for dealing with them. Hopefully, others contemplating or engaged in Re:Learning will be forewarned and thus be better able to deal with the concerns and barriers they encounter.

Experiences and Suggestions of Cycle I Schools/Districts

The primary concerns and barriers experienced at a significant number of the Cycle I sites, and some potential strategies for dealing with them, are listed as follows.

Changing staff perceptions and thinking. "The existing perceptions of staff about schooling and the structure of schools (norms and traditions, both stated and implied) are barriers. Overcoming the belief, by some, that participating in Re:Learning means that what we have been doing is wrong, can also be a problem. Among some staff there is a kill-the-messenger syndrome. Similarly, staff perceptions that board, administrator and faculty relationships are adversarial is a problem. Even when a project is empowered from above, and is designed to be bottom-up, you still get staff mistrust. Getting people to trust, think differently and take risks takes time and work. The administration needs to establish a climate that encourages staff to share their concerns, try new things and risk thinking differently. Staff need to be empowered. They need to be encouraged to

start thinking and doing, and to suggest alternatives to the traditional ways of doing things instead of just waiting and blaming. You may need help with this bottom-up piece though. Training staff (leadership training, CES site visits and workshops, networking with staff from other Re:Learning sites) helps to change teachers' perceptions of schooling and their role. Establishing a teacher coordinator position can also help to break down barriers between the administration and teachers."

Possible mixed reactions to the nine principles. "You can expect some initial negative faculty reactions to some of the CES principles: 'exhibitions of mastery,' 'teacher as generalist,' 'less-is-more,' and 'a less than ten percent increase in the budget.' Staff are concerned with their work loads, roles, and jobs. The potential implications of 'less-is-more' and 'teacher as generalist' are threatening to some staff. The union will also be likely to be concerned about furloughing. There may also be the perception at the high school level that 'less-is-more' is watering down the curriculum. Some of the mixed reactions can be countered by making sure you meet with your staff as a whole early on. Be sensitive to the reactions of elective teachers. Include these teachers in your early and ongoing planning efforts. It also helps if the superintendent assures all staff that no positions will be jeopardized as a result of Re:Learning. Finally, you have to talk to staff constantly until they clearly understand that Re:Learning is a philosophy and not a program."

Where is the model? "As a project leader, you start with a charge and a lot energy. But, there is no model, and some staff will question what Re:Learning is and where it is headed. The nine principles do tend to make sense to most teachers, but they will ask 'Where is the model?' It helps to send as many staff as possible to visit other CES schools and have them report back to the faculty. This first-hand experience will help diffuse concerns and provide concrete images of how Re:Learning looks in operation. As a project leader, you need to ride out this period of uncertainty. You don't need to have all the answers, but you do need to have a fire in you, vision and commitment."

Dealing with resisters. "You will encounter resisters and need to determine how you will deal with them. People don't want to change, especially at the senior high level. We generally found it was best to work around the resisters. We kept up a gentle peer pressure on them though. In the final analysis it's best if you talk less and listen more to staff. Be patient and persevere in your vision as you try to sell the program. Be gentle with your staff. Not all staff have to be in the same place at the same time."

Stimulating principals' involvement. "You need to involve actively the building principal. If the principal is reluctant to support the project you need to have strategies in mind to deal with the situation. If a principal has reservations about becoming involved, consider working with the district principals as a team and/or bring in involved principals from other sites to share their positive experiences with staff in an attempt to exert some influence or positive movement."

CES site visitations. "The visitations to other CES schools don't always go well, and there can be negatives after staff visit other CES

sites. During debriefing, let staff talk through the negatives they experienced, then turn the conversation to the positives and the potential of Re:Learning. Finding the time and the dollars to provide the time for school staff to discuss, study, explore, and debrief after CES school visits can also be a problem. Don't accept time as a problem. You can do anything if you want to. Don't accept the can'ts."

Competition among staff. "If you solicit Re:Learning proposals from the staff and some are funded while others are not, resentments can be created. Similarly, resentments are likely to emerge if you always select the same teachers to go to conferences and workshops. Don't create an elite group of teachers...the group that is always sought out by the central office or the group that always travels. Consider establishing and publicizing selection criteria for teachers' school visits and for proposal funding. Use peer groups or committees to make the selections. This will help to diffuse resentments. Additionally, if you are working at both the junior and senior high levels, there may be some problems and competition, especially if one level is perceived as being ahead of the other. Conduct cross-school meetings and establish a communication liaison between the groups to attempt to diffuse the competition and foster mutual support."

The local press. "Problems can also be encountered with the local newspaper especially if the budget is a hot local issue. Develop a personal contact at the local newspaper if possible. Spend some time acquainting that individual with the project. Prepare press releases and hope for the best."

Other concerns. Three other concerns focused on the topics of community involvement, scheduling, and the impact of Re:Learning on students' admission to college. The project directors/coordinators agreed upon the need to involve the community in Re:Learning. However, they indicated that "the decision about when and how to involve the community depends on the complexity of the issues and the amount of support (board, central office and teachers) you have at your site." In one sense they indicated that it is best if you have done your homework and have your own house in order before you go too public. On the other hand, conditions will never be perfect. Thus, it is a judgment call as to when and how to involve the community. Most suggested that, at a minimum, there should be representative involvement from the start.

Changing school schedules for groups of students and teachers to accommodate grade level interdisciplinary teaching teams was also acknowledged to be a formidable concern and task, given the complex schedules of most schools. No easy solutions were reported. Most of the Cycle I sites were in the process of planning or piloting various changes in their school schedules for some staff and students. They expected that the best solutions would be reached as the project evolved over time.

The question of the project's ultimate impact on students' admission to college (i.e., due to potential curriculum changes because of the concept "less-is-more" and the notion of "diplomas by exhibition") was also encountered at several of the sites. Since the projects have a long way to go to completion, responses to projected impact questions could only be speculative. The general response was that the district needed to be proactive

regarding the potential issue of college admissions and make every effort to anticipate and circumvent problems to insure that students would have no difficulties with admissions procedures/protocol. As a counterpoint, one project director speculated that students' participation in Re:Learning would likely have a dramatic positive impact on students' ability to succeed in college due to the project's emphasis on teaching students to: think and write critically; solve problems; apply information; and become self-directed, task-oriented learners confident in their own abilities to learn.

APPENDIX

RESOURCES PROVIDED BY CYCLE I SCHOOLS

Each of the Pennsylvania Cycle I Re:Learning schools/districts had occasion to acquire and/or develop resources pertinent to their exploratory and planning year efforts. The resources likely to be of interest to others considering or engaged in Re:Learning are listed by site.

In addition, each resource has been numbered and coded A, B, and/or C to identify the major task area(s) to which it relates. The task areas and related resources are listed as follows:

A. Providing Leadership and a Management Structure

13, 19, 24, 29, 31, 36

B. Building Understanding, Involvement, and Commitment

3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 35, 39

C. Deciding on a Focus and Engaging in Planning/Development/ Implementation

1, 2, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 23, 28, 30, 34, 37, 38

Copies of the cited resources may be obtained by contacting the Pennsylvania State Re:Learning coordinator, Ms. Jean di Sabatino at the Pennsylvania Department of Education, 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126-0333. Telephone: (717) 772-3817. Current state funding permits limited distribution of the resources to interested Pennsylvania sites.

BELLEFONTE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT RESOURCES

1. **Active Communication Time Proposal (ACT) (1990). [C]**

   This proposal sets forth recommendations for the faculty and staff to become student advisors, during 1990-91 school year. The recommendations suggest the restructuring of one class period and the elimination of homeroom in order to form ACT groups. The groups are comprised of teachers and staff who would provide non-threatening communication time, provide grade-level information, and foster communication between students, faculty, and staff. Inservice training and the development of a handbook with activities and procedures would be integral to the process.

2. **Bellefonte Area High School Ninth Grade Block Proposal (Fall 1990). [C]**

   A proposal for the establishment of a ninth grade team whose purpose is to develop an interdisciplinary curriculum that reflects the nine principles of CES. The proposed team would include 80 students, 4 subject area teachers, and 1 elective teacher. The proposal outlines the structure, plan of development, key elements, and implementation of the plan.

3. **Faculty Voting Ballot. [B]**

   A sample of a faculty "opinion" voting ballot, which asks school staff if they: support the Re:learning Project, and wish to see it implemented in slow stages; do not want to be involved, but don't object to others' involvement; or do not want the project implemented.

4. **Introduction to CES-Based Senior Humanities Course (1990-1991), by Susan L. Robb and John R. Ziegler. [C]**

   A paper which presents a brief overview of a proposed 12th grade Humanities Course, developed around the nine principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools. The proposed course will replace a senior's English and social studies course, will cover two semesters, be taught during two back-to-back periods, and target 36 students.

5. **LES IZMORE'S: Notes and Stuff on CES (February 14, 1990). [B]**

   A newsletter that informs school staff about the district's Re:Learning activities and events.

6. **Lunch With Les Notes (Fall 1990). [B]**

   The minutes/notes of the first "Lunch with Les." This brief report to school staff summarizes teacher thoughts expressed during the luncheon

regarding "creating a vision" for the school, and other issues relating to CES. The luncheon was one of two activities established by the CES planning committee to improve communications and to foster dialogue.

7. **Re:Learning: A Serious Study at Bellefonte Area High School (March 6, 1990). [B]**

An announcement to staff informing them that Bellefonte Area High School is one of eight Pennsylvania high schools participating in the state's Re:Learning project, and that the faculty and principal will begin an intensive study of the possibility of basing the school's educational program upon the nine principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES). Described are some of the possible benefits to students and faculty of such a restructuring effort. Also presented are the nine common principles of CES.

8. **Application for State Approval of In-service Credit. Course Title: Restructuring Secondary Education Utilizing Re:Learning Principles. [B]**

An application to conduct an in-service credit course for teachers that would enable them to learn and apply the principles of Re:Learning. A course description, needs statement, competencies to be developed, detailed course outline, evaluation and follow-up procedures, and a proposed budget are described.

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT RESOURCES

9. **Abstracts of Articles, Essays, Interviews, and A Selected Bibliography Related to the Re:Learning Project. [B]**

Descriptions of varied resource materials discuss such topics as the Coalition's principles, curriculum content, thinking skills, reports on the progress of the Coalition, conversations with Ted Sizer, and restructuring and school reform. A short bibliography of suggested readings is appended.

10. **C Beat (February 23, 1990). [B]**

A copy of a weekly newsletter produced by Central Bucks staff to inform the school community about Re:Learning and other topics of interest.

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT RESOURCES (CONT'D.)

11. **Four Proposals for High School Courses Applying CES Principles (1990). [C]**

Four pilot proposals describe high school courses that would apply the CES principles. The four proposals are: (1) an interdisciplinary approach to teaching world culture, combining elements of Western Civilization, European history, art and music, and foreign language; (2) applied biology and science, combining the study of human biology, physiology, and physical education and applying them in a student-designed "wellness" program; (3) an approach to teaching the "Rise of Western Civilization" that would include experiential elements; and (4) an interdisciplinary approach to working with at-risk students, using a performance-based learning environment to teach the Civil War through World War II history. Each proposal describes the teachers and students to be involved, the planning time and curriculum preparation required, and how CES' principles will be employed.

12. **Memoranda: Results of Our Meeting on Restructuring (December 12, 1989), and Meeting Agenda for the Participants in the School Board Work Session (February 13, 1990). [C]**

The first memorandum summarizes the thinking and ideas of the school board directors, secondary principals, curriculum supervisors and the Chairman of the Futures Committee related to three questions: What changes could be implemented...to bring us closer to the "ideal?" What essential performances should be demonstrated by our students by the time they leave high school? and What practices or conditions presently exit ...which promote the attainment of these "performances?" The second memo is an agenda for a school board work session that brought together representative faculty, administration, school board, and community members to view the Re:Learning teleconference and to develop statements for future action.

EASTERN LANCASTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (ELANCO) RESOURCES

13. **ELANCO's Re:Learning Project (1990). [A]**

These resource materials include: the district's Re:Learning committee structure; a working outline of the district's goals and activities for Re:Learning, with an emphasis on curriculum development; and a curriculum framework.

EASTERN LANCASTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (ELANCO) RESOURCES (CONT'D.)

14. **Garden Spot Junior High School Summary: Re:Learning Project 1989-90. [B/C]**

An information packet for junior high school staff that includes a summary of the project, the common principles of Ted Sizer, agendas of meetings and inservice, a copy of a survey with staff responses to questions relating to restructuring and changes that need to be made, a memo summarizing the faculty's thoughts on Coalition principles structured around specific questions posed to faculty about each principle, and an agenda for summer workshops.

15. **The Common Principles. [C]**

A sample questionnaire that solicits staff reactions to current school conditions and the extent to which they do or do not reflect the Principles of Re:Learning.

ELIZABETHTOWN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT RESOURCES

16. **Horace's Compromise: An In-Service Professional Reading Project.[B]**

Stimulus materials to structure the reading and small group discussion of Horace's Compromise: an overview of the content of Horace's Compromise and it's basic premise; a set of questions to simulate discussion; selected excerpts from the book that explicate key concepts, processes, applications; and a summary of the points discussed at the first two meetings of the reading group.

17. **The Ideal/Reality Exercise for Students (Spring 1986). [C]**

A summary report of the results of an "ideal/reality" exercise conducted with school staff. Appended is an overview of how to conduct the "exercise" from Tips for Principals, April 1989.

18. **The Shadow Study (Spring 1986). [C]**

A shadow study report that includes: instructions and worksheets for carrying out the study, the results of the month-long study, and an excerpt from a book which describes "The Shadow Study Technique."

LOWER DAUPHIN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT RESOURCES

19. **The Lower Dauphin Essential School Mission Statement (1989-1990). [A]**

    The school's mission statement, which describes the basis for its mission, its concept of schooling, and its expectations for students.

20. **(Not Quite) Everything You Wanted to Know About the Coalition, But Were Afraid to Ask (October 25, 1989). [B]**

    A memorandum to faculty to inform them about CES, the role of the Steering Committee, the current status of the project, and the potential impact on the school.

21. **Invitation and Information Letters to Parents Related to Re:Learning Meetings (November/December 1989). [B]**

    Samples of letters sent to parents inviting them to participate in various meetings/activities designed to inform them about Re:Learning, describe the Coalition's principles, and apprise them of the intended activities of the school in implementing the Re:Learning project.

22. **Dear Coalition Friends (May 7, 1990). [B]**

    A letter and sample article mailed to faculty, parents, and others to inform them of the school's CES activities. Article topics include restructuring a comprehensive high school, curriculum, and school reform issues.

NEW-HOPE SOLEBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT RESOURCES

23. **CES Idea Exchange, compiled by Wendy Forman, (November 29, 1989). [B/C]**

    Anecdotal information regarding teacher's exploratory applications of CES principles. Capsule descriptions of ideas/activities are provided by a variety of subject area teachers, from 4th grade to 12th grade. Enough information is provided to enable teachers interested in a given activity to communicate directly with another teacher to acquire additional information about the activity.

24. **CES Meetings: Visitation Summary and CES Visit Agenda (February 1990 & April 1990). [A/B]**

    Agenda of visits to Re:Learning schools in other states, and a sample form that teachers completed to be considered for participation on a visiting team. Also, an agenda and summary of a visit from Mike Goldman,

former teacher at Central Park East School, now a resource person with the Coalition, who recounted his experiences, shared ideas, and answered questions.

25. **Coalition of Essential Schools Meeting Notes (1988-1989). [B]**

Results of several inservice meetings of school staff related to Re:Learning are discussed. Reported are staff responses to a variety of questions regarding the implications and implementation of the Re:Learning project. Reasons for participating and concerns about participating are expressed by groups of subject area teachers.

26. **High School Receives $25,000 to Explore Promising Educational Practices, New Hope-Solebury School District Update (Fall 1989), page 2. [B]**

Article in the school district newspaper announcing New Hope-Solebury as one of eight school districts in Pennsylvania to receive a grant to explore CES; and how CES principles relate to the junior-senior high school.

27. **Jan. 8 NH-S Educational Forum to Explore Coalition of Essential Schools (December, 27, 1989). [B]**

A press release distributed to parents and community members announcing an educational forum to be held on January 8, to discuss the $25,000 CES planning grant and its implications for the school and community. The release describes CES' principles and some of the activities being conducted by staff.

28. **New Hope-Solebury Professional Mini-Grants Program (August 1989 and June 1990). [C]**

A description of a mini-grant program, criteria for applying, and the application forms provided for the 1989 and 1990 grants. Mini-grants of up to $300 per person were available for special classroom projects or enrichments programs designed to enhance and enrich opportunities for students. All professional staff were eligible to apply.

29. **1989 CES Planning Grant Budget (March 29, 1989). [A]**

A rationale, budget, and projected schedule of district Re:Learning exploratory events are detailed for February to September, 1989.

30. **Inservice Courses Available at New Hope-Solebury (September 1989-June 1990). [C]**

Descriptions of a number of courses related to the CES principles, offered to teachers (K-12), which include: language and learning across the curriculum, cooperative learning training, curriculum development designed to reflect CES principles, and a hands-on experience in designing "authentic classroom assessment of student learning" (portfolio, exhibitions, etc.), with Grant Wiggins.

31. **Reactions to In-Service Workshop: Team Building (September 1989). [A]**

Feedback from the secondary school staff regarding a beginning-of-the-year Re:Learning related team building workshop describing what they learned that would be of value to them.

32. **Re:Learning Questionnaire and Report by Joanne Mitchell (April 5, 1990). [B]**

Summarized results of a questionnaire administered to the Pennsylvania Cycle I Re:Learning district participants who attended a CES training session held in Harrisburg, April 4-6, 1990. This report describes: teachers' perceptions of why CES' principles are essential to them and their students, the pros and cons of CES, the changes teachers have made in their teaching since learning about CES, and why Pennsylvania should continue to support the Re:Learning effort.

33. **Responses to a January 1990 Community Education Forum on Coalition of Essential Schools (January 12, 1990). [B]**

This report summarizes feedback from parents in response to a forum on the Coalition of Essential Schools and includes a copy of a parent questionnaire. Parents' understandings of CES, concerns and questions are summarized.

34. **Sociology, Course Syllabus (1990). [C]**

A sample course syllabus for a sociology course that reflects CES' concept of essential questions.

35. **Summer Workshop: Student as Worker -- Teacher as Coach, for K-12 Staff (August 7-9, 1989). [B]**

Description of a workshop to provide teachers with practical ways to organize curriculum to maximize active learning. Appended are teachers' reactions to the workshop which describe: what I learned about myself as a teacher during this workshop, ways I can put this workshop to use in my teaching, and suggestions for improving the workshop.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA: AMY-6 RESOURCES

36. **Position Descriptions (January 1990). [A]**

Detailed job descriptions for the Re:Learning coordinator, evaluator, and researcher positions used by AMY-6 to select staff for these positions. (Posted positions/union contract and regulations).

37. **Four Sub-Committee Final Reports (June 1990). [C]**

Reports from the sub-committees on assessment, parent as collaborator, social responsibility, and curriculum, as they relate to Re:Learning. Each report describes the sub-committee's goals, activities and recommendations for the school regarding a designated area of Re:Learning.

TYRONE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT RESOURCES

38. **Proposed Beliefs (1989-90). [C]**

Statements of belief generated by representative teachers from the elementary and secondary staff, who worked together with administrators to develop a set of belief statements that reflect CES principles. The belief statements, upon board approval, will guide future decisions involving curriculum and instruction within the district.

39. **Nurturing Workshop (July 6-7, 1989). [B]**

An agenda and list of presenters for a workshop addressing the needs of adolescents and the ways in which schools must change to meet those needs. In addition to nurturing students, a focus was placed on the need for teachers to nurture teachers and administrators to nurture teachers. Teacher empowerment and teachers working as teams were also addressed.